



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

201
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,161	01/24/2001	Robert P. Loce	105432	9226
27074	7590	11/22/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			STREGE, JOHN B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625		

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/768,161	LOCE ET AL.
	Examiner John B Strege	Art Unit 2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) John B Strege. (3) G.W. Thielman.
 (2) Bhavesh Mehta. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 September 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claimed (see attached) & particularly claim 28

Identification of prior art discussed: Art of record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

I t was agreed that ^{proposed} claim 28 avoided art of record.
 With respect to independent ^{proposed} amended claim 1,
 applicant's attention was directed to (o) 15, lines 1-4 2.

BHAVESH M. MEHTA
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

Amendments to the Claims:

PROPOSED

The following listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for processing anti-aliased images comprising:
~~characterizing comparing at least one image portion of an anti-aliased input image using against one or more loose-templates to produce a comparison image; and processing the characterized comparison image to affect determine whether a second image match condition is satisfied.~~
2. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of processing controls at least one or more line-widths of the ~~second~~ comparison image.
3. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of ~~characterizing comparing~~ the anti-aliased image includes:
~~extracting the at least one or more image portions portion from the anti-aliased input image; and~~
~~performing a pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and the at least one image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features.~~
4. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 3, wherein the step of ~~characterizing comparing~~ further includes arbitrating between at least two or more features in the screen.
5. (Currently Amended) ~~The-A~~ method of claim 4 for processing anti-aliased images, comprising:
characterizing an anti-aliased input image using one or more loose-templates;

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

processing the characterized image to affect a second image, wherein the step of characterizing the anti-aliased image includes:

extracting one or more image portions from the anti-aliased input image; and
performing a pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and at least one image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features,
wherein the step of characterizing further includes arbitrating between at least two or more features in the screen, and the step of arbitrating effectively eliminates at least one feature.

6. (Currently Amended) The A method of claim 4 for processing anti-aliased images, comprising:

characterizing an anti-aliased input image using one or more loose-templates;
and

PROPOSED

processing the characterized image to affect a second image, wherein the step of characterizing the anti-aliased image includes:

extracting one or more image portions from the anti-aliased input image; and
performing a pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and at least one image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features,
wherein the step of characterizing further includes arbitrating between at least two or more features in the screen, and the step of arbitrating produces a new feature.

7. (Currently Amended) The A method of claim 4 for processing anti-aliased images, comprising:

characterizing an anti-aliased input image using one or more loose-templates;
and

processing the characterized image to affect a second image, wherein the step of characterizing the anti-aliased image includes:

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

performing a pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and at least one image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features, wherein the step of characterizing further includes arbitrating between at least two or more features in the screen, and the step of characterizing further includes arbitrating between at least two or more screens.

8. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of characterizing comparing further includes producing one or more feature vectors.

9. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the second comparison image is an anti-aliased image.

10. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of characterizing comparing includes reducing a resolution of at least a portion of the anti-aliased input image.

PROPOSED

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, further comprising comparing the anti-aliased image portion to at least one template.

12. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 2, wherein controlling the line-width of at least one of the one or more lines of the second comparison image includes controlling a growth of the at least one line-width.

13. (Original) The method of claim 12, wherein controlling the line-widths uses at least a look-up table.

14. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for processing images comprising:

at least one or more loose templates loose-template; and

a control device that produces a second comparison image based on comparing the at least one or more loose templates and loose-template against an anti-aliased image to determine whether a match condition is satisfied.

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

15. (Currently Amended) The apparatus of claim 14, wherein the control device controls at least one or more line-widths of the ~~second~~ comparison image.

16. (Currently Amended) The apparatus of claim 14, further comprising:
a windowing device that extracts one or more image portions from the anti-aliased image; and

a pattern matching device that performs at least one pattern matching operation between the at least one loose-template and at least one anti-aliased image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features.

17. (Original) The apparatus of claim 16, further comprising an arbitration device that arbitrates between at least two or more features in the screen.

~~18.~~ 18. (Currently Amended) The An apparatus of claim 17 for processing images,
comprising:

one or more loose-templates;
a control device that affects a second image based on the one or more
loose-templates and an anti-aliased image;
a windowing device that extracts one or more image portions from the
anti-aliased image;
a pattern matching device that performs at least one pattern matching operation
between at least one loose-template and at least one anti-aliased image portion to produce a
screen containing at least one or more features; and
an arbitration device that arbitrates between at least two or more features in the
screen, wherein the arbitration device effectively eliminates at least one feature.

~~19.~~ 19. (Currently Amended) The An apparatus of claim 17 for processing images,
comprising:

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

a control device that affects a second image based on the one or more loose-templates and an anti-aliased image;

a windowing device that extracts one or more image portions from the anti-aliased image;

a pattern matching device that performs at least one pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and at least one anti-aliased image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features; and

an arbitration device that arbitrates between at least two or more features in the screen, wherein arbitration device produces a new feature.

20. (Currently Amended) ~~The An apparatus of claim 17 for processing images, comprising:~~

one or more loose-templates;

PROPOSED

a control device that affects a second image based on the one or more loose-templates and an anti-aliased image;

a windowing device that extracts one or more image portions from the anti-aliased image;

a pattern matching device that performs at least one pattern matching operation between at least one loose-template and at least one anti-aliased image portion to produce a screen containing at least one or more features; and

an arbitration device that arbitrates between at least two or more features in the screen, wherein the arbitration device further arbitrates between at least two or more screens.

21. (Original) The apparatus of claim 14, wherein the control device produces one or more feature vectors based on the anti-aliased input image and one or more loose-templates.

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

22. (Currently Amended) The apparatus of claim 14, wherein the second comparison image is a second anti-aliased image.

23. (Original) The apparatus of claim 14, wherein the windowing device reduces a resolution of at least a portion of the anti-aliased image.

24. (Currently Amended) A method for processing anti-aliased images comprising:

PROPOSED

characterizing comparing at least one image portion of an anti-aliased input image using against one or more loose-templates to produce a comparison image, each loose-template having a plurality of image elements, wherein at least one of the image elements has a range greater than one; and

processing the characterized comparison image to affect determine whether a second image match condition is satisfied.

25. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for processing images comprising:
one or more loose-templates each having a plurality of image elements,
wherein at least one image element has a range greater than one; and
a control device that affects produces a second comparison image based on comparing the at least one or more loose-templates and loose-template against an anti-aliased image to determine whether a match condition is satisfied.

26. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining includes:
determining a characteristic relation between the at least one portion of the comparison image and the template to produce a characteristic determination;
comparing the characteristic determination against a template threshold; and
determining whether the characteristic determination satisfies a template comparison condition based on comparing against the template threshold.

Xerox Docket No. D/99094
Application No. 09/768,161

27. (New) The method of claim 26, wherein at least one of the one or more loose-templates contains a plurality of template elements, and the template threshold contains a uniform threshold value for the plurality of template elements.

28. (New) The method of claim 26, wherein at least one of the one or more loose-templates contains a plurality of template elements, and the template threshold contains a corresponding threshold values for each template element of the plurality of template elements.

29. (New) The apparatus of claim 14, wherein the control device includes:
a relating device that determines a characteristic relation between the at least one portion of the comparison image and the template to produce a characteristic determination;
a comparing device that compares the characteristic determination against a template threshold; and
a satisfying device that determines whether the characteristic determination satisfies a template comparison condition based on comparing against the template threshold.

30. (New) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein at least one of the one or more loose-templates contains a plurality of template elements, and the template threshold contains a uniform threshold value for the plurality of template elements.

31. (New) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein at least one of the one or more loose-templates contains a plurality of template elements, and the template threshold contains a corresponding threshold values for each template element of the plurality of template elements.

PROPOSED